

Air Quality Permitting Statement of Basis

June 15, 2007

Permit to Construct No. P-2007.0056

Potlatch Forest Products Corporation, Lewiston Facility ID No. 069-00001

Prepared by:

Dan Pitman, P.E. Senior Engineer Air Quality Division

Table of Contents

ACRO	NYMS, UNITS, AND CHEMICAL NOMENCLATURES	.3
1.	PURPOSE	.4
2.	FACILITY DESCRIPTION	.4
3.	FACILITY / AREA CLASSIFICATION	.4
4.	APPLICATION SCOPE	.4
5.	PERMIT ANALYSIS	.4
6.	PERMIT REVIEW	.8
7.	RECOMMENDATION	.8

Acronyms, Units, and Chemical Nomenclatures

acfm actual cubic feet per minute
AFS AIRS Facility Subsystem

AIRS Aerometric Information Retrieval System

AQCR Air Quality Control Region

ASTM American Society for Testing and Materials

BACT Best Available Control Technology

Btu British thermal unit CAA Clean Air Act

CFR Code of Federal Regulations

CO carbon monoxide

DEQ Department of Environmental Quality

dscf dry standard cubic feet

EPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

gpm gallons per minute

gr grain (1 lb = 7,000 grains) HAPs Hazardous Air Pollutants

hp horsepower

IDAPA a numbering designation for all administrative rules in Idaho promulgated in accordance with

the Idaho Administrative Procedures Act

km kilometer
lb/hr pound per hour
m meter(s)

MACT Maximum Achievable Control Technology

MMBtu million British thermal units

NESHAP National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants

NO₂ nitrogen dioxide NOx nitrogen oxides

NSPS New Source Performance Standards

 O_3 ozone

PM particulate matter

PM₁₀ particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 10 micrometers

ppm parts per million

PSD Prevention of Significant Deterioration

PTC permit to construct PTE potential to emit

Rules Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho

scf standard cubic feet

SIC Standard Industrial Classification SIP State Implementation Plan

SM Synthetic Minor
SO₂ sulfur dioxide
SOx sulfur oxides
T/yr tons per year

μg/m³ micrograms per cubic meter
UTM Universal Transverse Mercator
VOC volatile organic compound

1. PURPOSE

The purpose for this memorandum is to satisfy the requirements of IDAPA 58.01.01.200, Rules for the Control of Air Pollution in Idaho, for issuing permits to construct.

This PTC will replace PTC No. 069-00001 issued September 16, 1996 the terms and conditions of which shall no longer apply.

2. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

Potlatch Pulp and Paperboard Division (Potlatch) operates a kraft pulp mill in Lewiston, Idaho. The mill produces bleached kraft pulp, which is processed in three different areas. Uncoated and coated paperboard is produced in the paper machine area; market pulp is dried on the pulp dryer in the finishing area; and slurried pulp stock is pumped to the Potlatch Consumer Products Division, which is adjacent to the Idaho Pulp and Paper Division.

In the paper making process lignin is partially removed from the brownstock (pulp) by the oxygen delignification system. This statement of basis, and associated permit action, is limited to oxygen delignification system of the paper making process.

3. FACILITY / AREA CLASSIFICATION

Potlatch is classified as a major facility because the facility's potential to emit greater than 100 tons per year of a regulated air pollutant. The AIRS classification is A.

The facility is located within AQCR 062 and UTM zone 11. The facility is located in Nez Perce County which is designated as unclassifiable/attainment for all regulated criteria pollutants (PM10, CO, NO_X , SO_2 , lead, and ozone).

The previous AIRS information for this facility is not changed by this permit action therefore the AIRS information is not repeated as part of this statement of basis.

4. APPLICATION SCOPE

Potlatch requested to remove carbon monoxide emission rate limits and continuous emission monitoring requirements from the oxygen delignification permit.

4.1 Application Chronology

April 11, 2007	DEQ received a Permit to Construct Application from Potlatch
April 27, 2007	DEQ received an email from Potlatch with additional emissions data
May 9, 2007	DEQ determine the application complete

5. PERMIT ANALYSIS

This section of the Statement of Basis describes the regulatory requirements for this PTC action.

5.1 Equipment Listing

This statement of basis only entails the Oxygen Delignification system which is a custom manufactured processing unit.

5.2 Emissions Inventory

Potlatch submitted carbon monoxide emission rates from the Oxygen Delignification system that were derived from continuous emissions monitoring data for the years 2003 through 2006. Table 5.1 summarizes these emissions rates. The emissions data submitted by the applicant is included in Appendix A.

Table 2.1 Oxygen Delignification Carbon Monoxide Emissions Rates

Year	CO Emission Rates (T/yr)
2003	31.6
2004	38.6
2005	36.8
2006	41.4

Potlatch described the Oxygen Delignification system's potential to emit carbon monoxide by performing a statistical analysis on historical emissions data. However, potential to emit is by definition (IDAPA 58.01.01.006.71) the maximum capacity of an facility to emit under it's physical and operation design, and is not based on, or derived from, historical emission rates. Therefore, the statistical analysis that Potlatch provided did not give the facilities potential to emit because the maximum capacity to emit under it's physical and operation design was not provided. Also, the statistical analysis did not account for the upward trend in emission rates from 2003 to 2006 (a 31% increase of emissions).

5.3 Modeling

In accordance with DEQ Modeling Guideline, modeling is required if the increase in permitted emissions exceeds modeling thresholds. The modeling threshold for carbon monoxide is 14 pounds per hour. In order for modeling to be required for this permit action, which includes a request to remove the pound per hour carbon monoxide emission limit, the pound per hour emissions would have to increase by 14 pounds per hour over the current permitted value of 17 pounds per hour (or increase to 31 pounds per hour). Potlatch has operated the continuous emission monitor for over 10 years and reported the results to DEQ. During that time emissions were not reported to exceed 31 pounds per hour, and during the last 5 years the highest reported emissions were 17.1 pounds per hour. Therefore, modeling is not required in order to remove the pound per hour carbon monoxide emission limit.

5.4 Regulatory Review

This section describes the regulatory analysis of the applicable air quality rules with respect to this PTC.

IDAPA 58.01.01.201......Permit to Construct Required

The facility's proposed project does not meet the permit to construct exemption criteria contained in Sections 220 through 223 of the Rules. Therefore, a PTC is required.

IDAPA 58.01.01.203.....Permit Requirements for New and Modified Stationary Sources

¹ Per discussions with Clayton Steel, Air Quality Specialist, DEQ Lewiston Regional Office (5/22/07) PTC Statement of Basis

The applicant has shown to the satisfaction of DEQ that the facility will comply with all applicable emissions standards, ambient air quality standards, and toxic increments.

IDAPA 58.01.01.210......Demonstration of Preconstruction Compliance with Toxic Standards

Emissions of toxic air pollutants will not increase and a result of the permit changes, therefore preconstruction compliance requirements are not triggered for toxic air pollutants.

IDAPA 58.01.01.224.....Permit to Construct Application Fee

The applicant satisfied the PTC application fee requirement by submitting a fee of \$1,000.00 on April 13, 2007.

IDAPA 58.01.01.225.....Permit to Construct Processing Fee

There is not an emission increase from the permit modification (emission increase is less than 1 T/yr) and an engineering analysis was required; therefore, the associated processing fee is \$1,000.00. DEQ received the \$1,000.00 processing fee on June 13, 2007.

IDAPA 58.01.01.300......Procedure and Requirements for Tier I Operating Permits

The permit to construct modification will contravene the existing Tier I operating permit conditions. Therefore, Potlatch has requested to have the Tier I operating permit administratively amended in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.209.05.c to include the changes to the Oxygen Delignification System permit conditions after the permit to construct is issued.

5.5 Permit Conditions Review

All existing permit conditions for the Oxygen Delignification system are obsolete, modified or deleted. The following discussion describes all changes to the permit.

The existing permit (condition 3.2) required a source test within 180 days of startup of the facility. This condition is obsolete and is removed since the facility began operation over 10 years ago.

All the remaining existing permit conditions are either carbon monoxide emission limits or conditions requiring operating and maintaining a continuous emission monitor. Potlatch requested that the emission rate limits be removed from the permit as well as the requirements for the continuous emission monitor because they stated that the potential to emit is less than the permitted emission rate. In describing the potential to emit Potlatch submitted carbon monoxide emission data for years 2003 through 2006. This data shows that the actual carbon monoxide emissions are less than 61% of the 74.5 T/yr emission limit. As discussed in the Emission Inventory Section of this Statement of Basis, Potlatch did not demonstrate that the potential to emit under the facility's operational design capacity is less than the 74.5 T/yr emissions limit. The information provided simply showed that actual emissions during the years between 2003 and 2006 are less than the allowable emission limit. Therefore, the 74.5 T/yr emissions limit remains in the permit. The emissions data did demonstrate that actual emissions are sufficiently below annual emission limits that a continuous emission rate monitor is not warranted. The permit now requires a carbon monoxide emissions test once every five years instead of requiring continuous emissions monitoring.

The 17 pound per hour carbon monoxide emission limit has been removed from the permit. The annual emission rate limit remains to avoid triggering PSD. The pound per hour emission rate limit is not needed to protect the carbon monoxide ambient standard as discussed in the Modeling section of this Statement of Basis (Section 5.3).

Following is a discussion on the new permit conditions:

Permit Condition 2.3

Carbon monoxide emissions are limited to not exceed 74.5 tons per any consecutive 12-months. This emission limit is the same emission limit that the current permit has.

Permit Condition 2.5

Once each five years the permittee shall conduct a carbon monoxide performance test. During the test the oxygen rate to the system, lignin content of the pulp and the pulp throughput rate are required to be monitored because these variables are expected to correlate to emissions. An emission factor shall be developed in pounds of carbon monoxide emitted per ton of air dried pulp processed. Worst case emissions are expected to occur when the lignin removal from the pulp is high through the reactor, when the pulp throughput rate is high and when the oxygen addition rate is high. Worst case normal emissions would be presumed to be emissions that result from representative high: lignin removal rates, pulp throughput rates, and oxygen addition rates.

An emission test is required to assure ongoing compliance with the 74.5 ton per consecutive 12-month emission limit because: emission data submitted by Potlatch shows that emissions increased by 31% from 2003 to 2006; and because the maximum capacity of the oxygen delignification system to emit carbon monoxide is not known. If the emissions increase trend continues over the next 8 to 10 years emissions may exceed the allowable emission rate limit. Periodic emissions testing will assure compliance.

Permit Condition 2.6 & 2.7

Permit Condition 2.6 requires monthly and consecutive 12-month monitoring of throughput to the oxygen delignification system and Permit Condition 2.7 requires calculating the carbon monoxide emissions using the throughput data monitored by Permit Condition 2.6. The emissions calculations are not required until the source test is completed that is required by Permit Condition 2.5 which may be five years from the issuance of this permit.

5.6 Permit to Construct Processing Fee

There is not an emission increase from the permit modification (emission increase is less than 1 T/yr); and an engineering analysis was required; therefore, in accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.225 the associated processing fee is \$1,000.00. DEQ received the \$1,000.00 processing fee on June 13, 2007.

Table 6.1 PTC PROCESSING FEE TABLE

	Emissions Inventory						
Pollutant	Annual Emissions Increase (T/yr)	Annual Emissions Reduction (T/yr)	Annual Emissions Change (T/yr)				
NO_X	0.0	0	0.0				
SO_2	0.0	0	0.0				
CO	0.0	0	0.0				
PM_{10}	0.0	0	0.0				
VOC	0.0	0	0.0				
TAPS/HAPS	0.0	0	0.0				
Total:	0.0	0	0.0				
Fee Due	\$ 1,000.00						

6. PERMIT REVIEW

6.1 Regional Review of Draft Permit

A draft permit was provided to the Lewiston Regional Office for review on May 23, 2007. Comments received were incorporated into the statement of basis.

6.2 Facility Review of Draft Permit

On May 31, 2007 Potlatch was provided a draft of the permit and statement of basis for their review. Potlatch paid the \$1,000.00 permit to construct processing fee on June 13, 2007, no comments were received on the draft permit.

6.3 Public Comment

In accordance with IDAPA 58.01.01.209.05.c, the Department will provide for public comment and affected states review in accordance with Sections 209, 364, and 365 on the draft permit to construct.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Based on review of application materials, and all applicable state and federal rules and regulations, staff recommend that Potlatch Forest Products Corporation be issued a draft permit to construct and that the draft permit be made available for EPA and affected states review, and public comment.

DP/dp Permit No. P-2007.0056

Appendix A

Emissions Inventory & Statistical Analysis Provided By Potlatch

P-2007.0056

	tons per	30 011110		12 month average 12 month rolling	3-1
74.5	year limit		monthly lbs	tons	% of limit
	1.5	an-02	5346		
		eb-02	4238		
		lar-02	6323		
		pr-02	5508		
		ay-02	3939		
		un-02	5627		
		Jul-02	6652		
		ug-02	5472		
		ep-02	4577		
		oct-02	5932		
		ov-02	4744		
		ec-02	5309	32	43%
	J	an-03	5230	32	43%
	F	eb-03	4108	32	43%
	M	lar-03	5265	31	42%
	A	pr-03	4366	31	41%
		ay-03	3702	30	41%
		un-03	4619	30	40%
		Jul-03	5404	29	39%
		ug-03	7326	30	41%
		ep-03	7401	32	43%
		oct-03	8705	33	44%
		ov-03	6888	34	46%
	2.0		7290	35	47%
		ec-03		36	49%
		an-04	7249	(277)	50%
		eb-04	6565	37	
		lar-04	5416	37	50%
		pr-04	6743	39	52%
		ay-04	5402	40	53%
		un-04	3616	39	52%
		Jul-04	6195	39	53%
	A	ug-04	7466	39	53%
	S	ep-04	7781	40	53%
	C	ct-04	8068	39	53%
	N	ov-04	6784	39	53%
	D	ec-04	7135	39	53%
	J	an-05	6922	39	52%
		eb-05	5168	38	51%
		lar-05	3523	37	50%
		pr-05	5196	37	49%
		ay-05	4992	36	49%
		ay-05 un-05	5781	38	50%
		Jul-05	4864	37	49%
			6334	36	49%
		ug-05			2000
		ep-05	6599	36	48%
		oct-05	7420	35	47%
	100	ov-05	8346	36	49%
		ec-05	7170	36	49%
		an-06	7899	37	49%
		eb-06	6736	37	50%
	M	lar-06	7919	40	53%
	A	pr-06	5810	40	54%
	M	ay-06	5057	40	54%
	J	un-06	7228	41	55%
		Jul-06	6892	42	56%
		ug-06	8645	43	58%
		ep-06	9159	44	59%
	(ct-06	9393	45	61%
		ov-06	9393 6835	45 44	61% 60%

O2 delig potential to emit for CO 4/27/07

Base data is daily production and emission data from July 2005 through May 2006

Used days when production was "normal" (over 1000 tons per day, 239 days)

Average CO emission factor is 0.20 lbs per ton Standard deviation is 0.05 lb/ton

An emission factor with a 95% confidence level = average + 2 standard deviations = 0.30 lb/ton.

Average production rate is 48.4 tons pulp per hour Standard deviation is 3.9 tons pulp per hour

A production rate with a 95% confidence level = average + 2 standard deviations = 56.2 tons pulp per hour

Hourly PTE =

56.2 tons pulp per hour x 0.30 lb. CO per ton = 16.8 lb per hour

Annual PTE =

56.2 tons pulp per hour x 8760 hours per year x 0.30 lb. CO per ton / 2000 lb/ton = 73.8 tons CO/year. (this is a conservative production estimate – approximately 30% greater than actual 2006 production).